



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,655	12/08/2003	Srikanth Karimisetty	021756-005100US	4960
51206 7590 09/03/2008 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834				
EXAMINER				
BEITZ, JACOB F				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2169				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/03/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

## Application No.

10/731,655

## Applicant(s)

KARIMISETTY ET AL.

## Examiner

Jacob F. Bétit

## Art Unit

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/29/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-26 have been examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 7, 9-14, 18-20, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Implementing Oracle Workflow, Published in 1999, Known hereafter as Mathieson in view of US 2004/0187127 (Gondi).

4. **Claim 1** is rejected for the following reasons:

Mathieson Teaches:

1. A method of committing a transaction to a database, the method comprising: creating an electronic record;{Figure 1 Shows that the record contains transaction data using the broadest reasonable interpretation } executing a rule associated with the record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review and/or approval of the electronic record;{Figures 3 and 5} requesting the electronic signature based on a determination that an electronic signature is required{ Figure 3 }

Art Unit: 2169

However, Mathieson fails to expressly disclose: intercepting the transaction data from the database transaction, the transaction being an atomic action that initiates the transaction and checks that all requirements are fulfilled before committing the transaction in order to commit the database transaction to the database. Yet, this feature would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention as it is taught by Gondi figure 1 and paragraphs 0020, 0021, and 0023 to provide the advantage of making all or none of the transaction committed.

5. **Claim 2** is rejected for the following reasons:

2. The method of claim 1 wherein the electronic record comprises data generated from multiple tables of the database. { Mathieson comprises multiple tables, and by incorporating the data from these tables would result in Maintaining a complete record. }

6. **Claim 3** is rejected for the following reasons:

3. The method of claim 1 wherein the electronic record is stored in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or disabled by users of the database. {Mathieson Figures 11 and 12, 1 teach a secure audit trail for the database objects, which inherently cannot be altered or disabled as it is used for proof of users signatures}

7. **Claim 7** is rejected for the following reasons:

7. The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of displaying at least some of the transaction data in the electronic record on a computer display and requesting the electronic

Art Unit: 2169

signature based on the determination that an electronic signature is required {Mathieson Page 2  
signature is applied to a field in the document}

8. **Claim 9** is rejected for the following reasons:

9. The method of claim 1 further comprising obtaining and verifying the electronic signature {Mathieson Inherently must check to see if the password is correct see page 2}

9. **Claim 10** is rejected for the following reasons:

10. The method of claim 1 wherein the rule requires a plurality of different electronic signatures and wherein, if execution of the rule results in a determination that a plurality of electronic signatures are required, requesting the plurality of electronic signatures prior to committing the data to the database. {Mathieson Figure 3}

10. **Claim 11** is rejected for the following reasons:

11. The method of claim 9 wherein, if the electronic signature is rejected or otherwise cannot be obtained, the transaction is rolled-back and not committed to the database. {it is inherent that the database manager would not allow a transaction to be committed wherein an electronic signature was rejected, which would result in a roll-back, Gondi figure 1}

11. **Claim 12** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 1 rejection.

Art Unit: 2169

12. **Claim 13** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 2 rejection.

13. **Claim 14** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 3 rejection.

14. **Claim 18** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 9 rejection.

15. **Claim 19** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 1 rejection.

16. **Claim 20** is rejected for the following reasons:

20. The computer program of claim 19 wherein the code for creating an electronic record creates electronic records in response to the occurrence of a predefined event. {Mathieson figures 2 and 3}

17. **Claim 21** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 3 rejection.

18. **Claim 25** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 9 rejection.

19. Claims 4- 6, 15-17, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of Gondi in further view of 2001/0002485 known hereafter as Bisbee and “Integrating XML and Databases” known hereafter as Bertino.

20. **Claims 4 and 5** are rejected for the following reasons:

Mathison and Gondi fail to expressly disclose the use of XML Documents. Bisbee also teaches the objects being XML documents, para 71. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use XML as a well-known standard which provides the advantage of being easily supported. However, it is not expressly stated in the above mentioned references how the data is stored within the database. Bertino teaches the storage of an unstructured XML document as a column of a table as a CLOB datatype, page 86 col 1. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features as it provides an organized method for storing the objects.

Also note, “Oracle Workflow Release 2.6.2 Business Event System and PL/SQL Development Guidelines” teaches that Oracle Workflow typically uses XML Documents on page 15.

21. **Claim 6** is rejected for the following reasons:

6. The method of claim 5 wherein XML fields of the data are filled with the transaction data based on a predefined mapping of a data type definition to multiple data sources. {Sec Bertino, The formatting of data into an XML file is inherently done using the mapping of a DTD to

multiple data sources, as the DTD defines how data is mapped and related in the XML file}

22. **Claim 15** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 4 rejection.

23. **Claim 16** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 5 rejection.

24. **Claim 17** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 6 rejection.

25. **Claim 22** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 4 rejection.

26. **Claim 23** is rejected for the following reasons:

See claim 5 rejection.

27. **Claim 24** is rejected for the following reasons:

28. See claim 6 rejection.

Claim 8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of Gondi  
in further view of Bisbee in view of Official Notice.



29. **Claim 8**, as best understood, is rejected for the following reasons:

8. The method of claim 7 wherein the transaction data in the electronic record is displayed according to a predefined layout set forth in an XSL style sheet and wherein the data further comprises a copy of the electronic record as displayed in a second column of the database table.

Bisbee teaches XML for formatting the data and having data that contains copies {Para 100}, but fails to expressly disclose how the data is presented to the user, and the data being stored in tables. The examiner takes official notice that the use of XSL to provide a layout for displaying XML documents was well known at the time of the invention, as was the ability to store data in tables. Thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so a XSL is the language for determining XML document presentation and store data in tables.

30. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson in view of Gondi in further view of Bisbee and Bertino and Official Notice.

31. **Claim 26** is rejected for the following reasons:

26. A method of committing a transaction to a database, the method comprising: intercepting transaction data from a database transaction to create an electronic record prior to committing the associated database transaction to the database in response to the occurrence of a predetermined event{See Claims 1 and 20 rejections}, wherein the electronic record comprises the transaction data stored as a well-formed XML document {See claims 4 and 5 rejection}in a

Art Unit: 2169

character large-object (CLOB) format of a column of a database table; storing the electronic record in a common repository of electronic records that provides an audit trail that cannot be altered or deleted by users of the system;{see claim 3 rejection} executing a rule associated with the electronic record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review and/or approval of the electronic record in order to commit the database transaction to the database;{see claim 1 rejection} and if execution of the rule results in a determination that an electronic signature is required, (i) displaying the transaction data in the electronic record according to a predefined layout set forth in an XSL style sheet associated with the electronic record and storing a copy of the transaction data as displayed in a character large-object (CLOB) format of a second column of the database table and (ii) requesting, obtaining and verifying the electronic signature prior to committing the transaction into a database.{See claim 9 rejection} and committing the transaction in response to verifying the electronic signature {See claim 1 rejection}

Bisbee teaches the objects being XML documents, Para 71, however it is not expressly stated how the data is stored within the database. Cheng teaches the storage of an XML document as a column of a table as a CLOB data type. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include these features in the invention of Bisbee as it provides a organized method for storing the objects.

Bisbee also fails to teach the use of XSL for displaying XML documents. The examiner takes official notice that the use of XSL to provide a layout for displaying XML documents was well

known at the time of the invention. Thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to do so a XSL is the language for determining XML document presentation.

Bisbee para 33 teaches copies of the object being signed and stored and 106 teaches using versioning, however it fails to mention these documents being stored in a second column of a database table as a clob. The act of using a clob is discussed above, and the examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the art to store updated versions of a document in a table with a column for each version. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature, as it would provide organized structure to the objects.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 29 May 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the combination of references for claim 1 does not teach "intercepting transaction data from the database transaction to create an electronic record prior to committing the associated database transaction to the database", the arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. Gondi teaches putting transaction messages into a queue until the messages are committed. This queue intercepts the transaction until the transactions are committed. If the transaction does not commit the completed units of work in the transaction can be rolled back. Therefore, the combination of Gondi with Mathieson teaches the recited limitation.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the combination of references for claim 1 does not teach "executing a rule associated with the electronic record to determine whether an electronic signature is required to connote review of the electronic record in order to commit the database transaction to the database", the arguments have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive. Matheison teaches executing a rule to determine if an electronic signature is required to connote review of a record as disclosed in the rejection. Gondi is used to disclose the committing of transactions and tying multiple units of work together to be associated with a single transaction. When looking at the Matheison reference, one of those units of work would be checking if a electronic signature is required. Therefore the combination of both references teaches the recited limitation. One cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

#### Conclusion

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Bétit whose telephone number is (571)272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 10:30 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jfb  
2 Sep 2008

/Neveen Abel-Jalil/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2165